



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,527	05/23/2001	Kenneth Mark Wilson	HP-10012389	3037

7590

09/22/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THAN VINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2187	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,527

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examiner

Than Nguyen

Art Unit

2187

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20040915

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Than Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit: 2187

Art Unit: 2187

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/18/04 has been entered.

2. The amendment, filed 5/18/04, has been entered.

3. Claims 1-23 are pending.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

4. Applicant has amended the claims to include new limitations not previously considered. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinsorge et al (US 6,247,109).

As to claim 1,14:

Kleinsorge teaches a system having a partitioned memory, said system comprising:

a processor (CPU; Figure 4);

Art Unit: 2187

a hardware implemented memory router coupled to said processor; memory coupled to said memory router (computer system 200 implementing memory map); said memory router configured to store memory partition information, said information describing the memory allocated to said processor; and said memory router operable to map a memory access request having an address from said processor to an address in said memory allocated to said processor wherein routing of data between the processor and the memory coupled to said memo router is not under control of software (system performs memory map of partitions assigned to CPUs; Abs; 4/60-66). Although Kleinsorge teaches the routing using software it should be noted that it is well-known in the art that any functional hardware can also be performed/implemented by software. Implementing software into pure hardware benefits in a faster and dedicated system. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to implement the routing software function of Kleinsorge into hardware that is independent of any software to perform the claimed functions of the invention.

As to claim 2:

Kleinsorge teaches at least a second processor coupled to said memory router, wherein said system comprises a plurality of processors (plural CPUs); said memory partition information stored in said memory router further describes the memory allocated to each of said plurality of processors; and said memory router is further operable to map memory access requests from said plurality of processors to respective addresses in said memory allocated to each of said plurality of processors (assigning partitions to plural CPUs; 4/55-65).

As to claim 3,22:

Art Unit: 2187

Kleinsorge teaches said memory partition information further describes the type of access each processor of said plurality has to each portion of its allocated memory; and said memory router is further operable to determine whether a memory access request having a first address from a first processor of said plurality is valid for said first address, based on the type of access and said first address (access type restriction; 12/55-62).

As to claims 5,6,15,17,19:

Kleinsorge teaches said router is re-configurable by altering said memory partition information, wherein said memory allocated to said plurality of processors is re-allocable (memory map can be reconfigured; 4/63-5/3).

As to claim 7,23:

Kleinsorge teaches said memory router comprises a first component and a second component, said first and said second components coupled by a communication link; said first component (memory address) operable to add a key to said memory access request, said key identifying said second processor; and said second component (memory map) operable to use said key to route said request to said address in said memory allocated to said second processor, wherein multiple processors using the same communication link and using overlapping addresses securely access said memory (the requested address is mapped using the memory map to allow access to the requested area 4/60-65; Abstract).

As to claim 8,21:

Kleinsorge teaches the memory partition information is stored in a table containing a translation from processor address space to memory (memory map; 18/60-19/5).

As to claim 9:

Art Unit: 2187

Kleinsorge teaches said table further comprises information allocating to a first processor of said plurality read only access to a first memory partition and to a second processor read and write access to said first memory partition (setting access rights; 19/1-5).

As to claim 10:

Kleinsorge teaches a more than one processor has access to a memory partition, wherein said memory is shared and said memory router has control over memory access (shared access rights; 18/60-19/5).

As to claim 11:

Kleinsorge teaches said plurality of processors are coupled to said memory router via a single communication link (bus 122 ; Figure 1).

As to claim 12:

Kleinsorge teaches said plurality of processors are coupled to said memory router via a plurality of communication links (memory map is coupled to bus for memory mapping; Figure 1; 6/50-61; 18/60-19/5).

As to claim 13:

Kleinsorge teaches a first processor of said plurality runs a first operating system and said second processor of said plurality runs a second operating system and wherein said second processor is allowed to read the memory allocated to said first processor but is not allowed to write to said memory allocated to said first processor (privileged/restricted access; 18/60-19/5).

As to claim 16:

Kleinsorge teaches re-configuring said memory router with commands entered via an external port to said memory router, wherein software executing on said plurality of processors is

Art Unit: 2187

unable to modify said memory router (reconfiguring by system manager; 4/55-67).

As to claim 20:

Kleinsorge inherently teaches adding information to said memory request, said information specifying the processor of said plurality of processors which made said memory request, said plurality of processors sharing a communication link; and e) after receiving said memory request via said communication link, said memory router using said information to determine which processor made said memory request (request processor knows who the request is from; 9/30-37) .

As to claim 4,18:

Kleinsorge does not specifically teach said type of access is selected from the group consisting of read only, write only, and read/write access. Kleinsorge does teach restricting access from non-privileged CPUs. One ordinary of skills in the art would recognize that restricting access types such as read-only , write-only, and read/write only are examples of such access restriction. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills to restrict access to certain access types; such as read-only , write-only, and read/write only to restrict access to certain restrict/privileged memory areas, as suggested by Kleinsorge.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Than Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-3pm M-F.

Art Unit: 2187

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks can be reached on 308-1756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Than Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2187